REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's Office Action of December 10, 2010 issued in relation to the present Patent Application, the Applicant submits the below Remarks.

Claims 10-14, 17-21, 23 and 25-27 are presented for examination. Claims 10 and 17 are independent claims.

Regarding 35 USC 103 Rejections

Claims 10-11, 14, 17-21, 23, and 27 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiroshi (JP 2002-312149).

Claims 12, 13, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiroshi in view of Vagui (US 6,474,882), and further in view of Sesek et al. (US 2004/0085568).

10. (Currently amended)   A printing system including:
a printer configured to receive documents to be printed from a computer system, the printer including an interface, and being configured to:
    receive, via the interface, input from a user indicative of a print command;
    send, from the printer to the computer system, a print request;
    receive, from the computer system and in response to the print request, a document to be printed; and
    print the document; and
    the computer system, the computer system running a print control program and at least one application program for displaying or generating the document to the user, the computer system being configured and programmed such that, in response to receiving the print request, the print control program simulates a keyboard sequence and an appended carriage return in the application program, thereby causing the document to be sent to the printer for printing.

Independent claim 10 defines that "*in response to receiving the print request, the print control program simulates a keyboard sequence and an appended carriage return in the application program*". Examiner argues that, since the program taught in Hiroshi automatically prints whatever is in the application program, and as if a keyboard sequence for printing has been performed by the user, Hiroshi teaches the above feature of the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The fact that the input (pressing a button on a printer) and the output (printing) are the same in Hiroshi as claimed in the claimed invention is irrelevant in assessing the patentability of the claimed invention. Whether or not the cited art teaches or suggests all the limitations of the claimed invention is however relevant in assessing the patentability of the claimed invention.

The fact that the action in Hiroshi prints automatically "as if" a keyboard sequence for printing has been performed by the user does not teach the limitation of <u>simulating</u> a keyboard sequence in an application program. Applicant again stresses that the limitation is not that a result that is the same as than occurring when a keyboard sequence is performed by a user is affected, but rather that a keyboard sequence is simulated. <u>Simulating</u> a keyboard sequence in an application program is not taught or suggested in Hiroshi teaching that an action occurs "as if" a keyboard sequence for printing has been performed by the user.

The same arguments apply to independent claim 17.

In order to advance prosecution the independent claims have been further limited.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims, as amended, are allowable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Kia Silverbrook, Managing Director

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: pair@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762